DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 911 FL 004 549

AUTHOR	Jenkins, Mary
TITLE	Bilingual Education in New York City.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Bilingual Education.; New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Personnel.
PUB DATE	Jun 71
NOTE	79p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Biculturalism; *Bilingual Education; Bilingualism; Bilingual Schools; Bilingual Students; Bilingual Teachers; *Educational Policy; *English; Financial Support; Language Programs; Minority Groups; Non English Speaking; *Puerto Ricans; Second Language Learning; Second Languages; *Spanish; Spanish Speaking
IDENTIFIERS	*New York City

ABSTRACT

This report attempts to place in perspective the position of bilingual education in New York City. It is divided into the following sections: (1) Bilingual Education--A Historical Perspective, (2) The Puerto Rican Child in the New York City School System, (3) Bilingual Education in the New York City School System, (4) Funding for Bilingual Programs, (5) Rationale for Bilingual Education, (6) Summary and Conclusions, (7) Appendixes, and (8) Bibliography. Included are various tables for the presentation of statistical material. (SK)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 084911

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

IN

NEW YORK CITY

Prepared for the program of
Recruitment and Training of
Spanish-speaking Teachers

Board of Education
Office of Personnel

Mary Jenkins

June 1971

FL004 549

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Bilingual Education - A Historical Perspective	1
II.	The Puerto Rican Child in the New York City School System	8
III.	Bilingual Education in the New York City School System	25
IV.	Funding for Bilingual Programs	32
V.	Rationale for Bilingual Education	40
VI.	Summary and Conclusions	45
VII.	Appendices	50
VIII.	Bibliography	68

INTRODUCTION

In our school system, the words "Bilingual Education" have probably been used more frequently in the last five years than in the previous 50 years. The words do not signify the same thing to all of us who have used them. This lack of uniformity in the definition of Bilingual Education has created some confusion and has prevented a systematic approach in the development of a policy for Bilingual Education.

The Preservice Program for Spanish-speaking Bilingual Personnel Serving Eligible children in Title I and Title VII Programs, formerly known as Recruitment and Training of Spanish-speaking Teachers, is a bilingual program which was established to address itself to the critical bilingual personnel needs in our school system. It became apparent, from the program's inception, that information regarding the actual personnel needs was not readily available. Although several programs were in operation, very few people in our school system had sufficient information about them. Individuals and organizations seeking information regarding bilingual educational programs often contacted the Preservice Program for Spanish-speaking Bilingual Personnel seeking this information.

Readers of this survey should keep in mind that it was completed early in June of 1971. Since that date there have been several developments in Bilingual Education which are not, therefore, included. After June 1971, the Chancellor appointed a Bilingual Commission to establish an Office of Bilingual Education to deal systematically with most of the issues which

have been raised in this report. The Preservice Program for Spanish-speaking Bilingual Personnel Serving Eligible Children in Title I and Title VII Programs came close to being eliminated in the fall of 1971, due to objections raised by its funding source--the Title I Office in Albany. This particular crisis experienced by a needed bilingual program further demonstrated the present instability in which many bilingual programs find themselves.

The historical perspective in which bilingual education in New York City has been surveyed does not, of-course, include all details. For, example, the fact that the New York City School System made some efforts to work with the Department of Instruction of Puerto Rico was not fully documented. Programs such as Operation Understanding, although small, demonstrated what was a tendency in the New York City school system to seek answers through the help of the educational system of Puerto Rico.

This present survey on the status of bilingual education in New York City was, in great part, initiated because of the practical need to know what bilingual programs were functioning, to begin an assessment of efforts undertaken and to seek out clues which in turn would help us to find a proper direction. It was clear that New York City has not, up to now, developed a bilingual educational policy for the children who need it. We hope that the present survey will serve as a starting point towards that goal. This survey indicates how far we have traveled in the process leading to an educational policy, and it also indicates areas which should be further examined. There are more questions raised than answers given in the pages of this survey, but perhaps this is inevitable since the concept of bilingual education is a dynamic one and one which touches the nerve endings of a living and vibrant Hispanic community seeking to resolve some of its immediate needs through the traditional means of formal education.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION--A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Throughout history America has attracted ethnic groups from all parts of the world. Until the end of the 19th century they came primarily from northern and western Europe and settled within a society which had not as yet evolved its concept of what constituted an American or who could become one.

Contrary to the general impression that immigrants came with the desire to become assimilated, strong and persistent efforts were made by them to maintain their language and culture. A major study conducted and published by Dr. Joshua Fishman entitled Language Loyalty[1] records this facet of immigrant behavior. In their new environment, immigrants felt the need to articulate and formalize activities which had existed naturally and traditionally in their native countries, Schools, shops and clubs were organized to provide the structure within which their ethnicity could be preserved. There were no legislated or official restrictions on these activities. When schools were established they were mainly concerned with meeting the needs of religious and ethnic groups as they determined.

---

[1] Fishman, Joshua, et al. Language Loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Monton & Company, 1966

By 1800 the German settlers had about 250 religious schools which taught in German.[2] When the public schools were established in the 1830's they were resisted by many of the English, German, and French Settlers who resented taxation for what they considered to be "Charity Schools," which did not reflect or emphasize their interest.

As the public schools expanded, they did respond in many areas to the demands of the largest non-English speaking group in the 19th century, the Germans. Cincinnati had schools which provided bilingual instruction from 1840 to 1917. So, too, did the cities of Baltimore, Dayton, Indianapolis, Harrisburg, and Lancaster.[3] Both the German and English languages were used for instructional and cultural purposes.

New Mexico had schools in which Spanish was the dominant language and laws which required that teachers be proficient in both languages. An Editorial in a Sante Fe newspaper in 1833 reflects a bilingual attitude which was soon to change.

> When New Mexico says that the teaching of English in our public schools should be compulsory by legislation enactment. It does not mean that the Spanish Language should be excluded....have the teaching of English and Spanish compulsory.'[4]

During the 19th century the parochial schools continued as active centers for teaching in the foreign Languages or using bilingual instruction. The French Canadians in New England had the most extensive network of bilingual schools, where often the day's instruction was divided between the two language. Other ethnic groups, auch as the Scandinavians, Dutch, Slovaks, and Poles, also received

---

2 Ibid., p. 216.

3 Ibid., p. 236.

4 Ibid., p. 297.

instruction in their respective languages within their own established parochial schools.

Bilingual education existed in public and parochial schools during this period when communities pressured and organized for it. American society was receptive or, at least, neutral to the idea for those who wished to continue their language and traditions. This was no longer true as America entered the 20th century.

New waves of immigrants now coming from southern and eastern Europe began to encounter resistance from the established groups. By the end of World War I, an atmosphere of xenophobia and racism culminated in immigration selection and restriction. Quotas were established to encourage those ethnic groups who would Americanize more easily and were considered superior. The term "minority" came to be used with a disparaging connotation as Italians, Poles, and other groups were viewed as problems because of their language and customs.

The public school system became an important means of Americanizing and assmilating foreigners. Laws were established in most states requiring English as the only language of instruction and going so far as to prohibit the teaching of any foreign language in public or private schools below the 8th or 9th grades. This foreign language restriction was declared unconstitutional in 1923, but the "English only" law still exists in many states, including New York.[5] Exceptions were recently made in the New York law for experimental programs which are discussed in the following chapter.

---

[5] "American Heritage," The Center Forum (Excerpted from Language Loyalty). Vol. IV, No. 1, 1969, p. 19.

Since World War II, the attitude towards foreigners and the use and knowledge of foreign languages have changed as America has increasingly involved in international politics and as Americans have traveled abroad and become better educated. A more reflective, critical approach has developed towards some of the assumptions in our national ideals and objectives. What is emerging as an unanswered question is the degree to which ethnic groups have been assimilated and, more importantly, whether the process of assimilation and acculturation, the melting pot ideal, was and is a desirable national policy.

The major non-English language groups in the country today are Spanish-speaking and they are pressuring for bilingual education as did preceding ethnic groups in the previous century. The same reason prevails--the desire to maintain their language and culture; but, there is an additional factor, and that is the present system of education has not provided large groups of non-English-speaking children with a reasonable level of education. Studies and educational conferences have concluded that the educational system which required English as the only language of instruction was a critical factor in a child's poor performance and attitude towards learning.[6]

---

[6] "The Invisible Minority," National Education Association Report of the NEA - Tuscan Survey on the Teaching of Spanish to the Spanish-speaking.
Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1966.

In 1963, a bilingual public school was established in Dade County, Florida, for Cuban immigrants, in which morning instruction was in one language and afternoon instruction in the second language. The program also included English-speaking children of the community, who would be taught Spanish and English within this structure. The program is proving to be extremely successful for both groups.

The following year, two programs were organized in Texas, and prior to the passage of Title VII in 1968 there were eight programs in Texas; two in California; and one each in New Mexico, New Jersey, and Arizona. The latter was the first bilingual program for Indians.

In 1968, the federal government first formalized a policy and definition of bilingual education with the passage of the Bilingual Education Act, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The policy is to provide financial assistance for the special educational needs of children of limited English ability in schools with a high concentration of low income families (less than $3,000 or receiving public assistance). The importance of English continues to be emphasized but Title VII adds that the use of the native language as a medium of instruction before English is acquired will help to prevent retardation in school.[7]

Title VII Legislation defines bilingual education as instruction in two languages and the use of those two languages as mediums of instruction for any or all of the school curriculum. Study of the history

---

[7] "Draft Guidelines to the Bilingual Education Program, Title VII, Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965," as amended in 1967, p. 1.

and culture associated with a student's mother tongue is considered an integral part of bilingual education.[8]

As a statement of national policy, the recognition of the importance of the native language for instructional purposes and its continuation beyond the acquisition of English is of major significance. However, the translation of a policy statement into implementation and resource allocation has not been significantly or broadly evidenced since the passing of the Title VII law. The programs that do exist are primarily for Mexican Americans but include Puerto Ricans, Portuguese, Chinese, Navajo, Japanese and French.

American education has not been the first to respond to the bilingual needs of its population. Throughout the world there are many countries with different language groups within their boundaries, and specific governments have responded in a variety of ways. There are bilingual educational systems in existence today outside the United States. The following are some examples:

Canada	Two official languages are taught in the school. The language of the majority group in each school is used for instruction and the second language is taught as a subject.
Russia	Many of the important minority languages are used for instruction in the primary schools. There are also schools with complete instruction in a foreign language such as English or French, etc., and Russian is taught as a subject.

---

[8] Ibid., p. 1

[9] Anderson, Theodore and Mildred Boyer. Bilingual Schooling in the United States. (Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Austin, Texas) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2 vols., 1970.

Wales	Some schools teach all subjects in two languages.
Philippines	The first language is used for two years and then the official language is used.

II

THE PUERTO RICAN CHILD IN THE NEW YORK CITY SCHOOL SYSTEM

New York City as the main gateway for millions of immigrants became the most culturally diversified city in the country. Dynamic centers of ethnicity such as El Barrio, Little Italy, Chinatown, Yorkville, Williamsburg and Harlem evidenced the settlement of different groups and the preservation of their heritage.

There were many ethnic schools usually associated with churches and Saturday schools. But there is no record of any bilingual instruction or special programs in the New York City public schools for non-English-speaking children which existed in some of the cities previously mentioned.

Over the years, non-English-speaking children sat in the New York City classrooms waiting to learn English so that they could learn other subjects. Many never finished any significant level of education and dropped out of school. Statistics were not kept, but some estimates have indicated that in the past less than half the children ever went to high school and of those only a small percentage was graduated. Prior to America becoming a highly industrialized society, students could drop out of school into a job market which required little education and offered many unskilled positions.

Along with many other states, a law was passed in New York State in the 1920's which required that all instruction in school be conducted in English. There is no evidence that this approach was based upon a pedagogical rationale, but, rather, that it was a

reflection of how our society viewed the function of the schools for the many foreigners who were coming here. "English only" in the classroom was to be part of the system by which the non-English-speaking child would become Americanized. This State law is still in existence today, though in 1969 and 1970 amendments were made which modified the English requirement as follows:

> "English shall be the language of instruction and textbooks used shall be written in English except for a period of three years from the date of enrollment in school. Pupils who, by reason of foreign birth... experience difficulty in reading and understanding English, may in the discretion of the school districts and Board of Education...be instructed in all subjects in their native language and in English. ... in no event shall a bilingual program of instruction for any one student exceed three successive years."[10]

An exception is made in the law for local education agencies to apply for Title VII funds for bilingual programs.

Thus, the law presently allows special programs for those who are experiencing difficulty in learning English, but basically the "English only" concept of this law is still the framework within which our public schools approach the education of non-English-speaking children.

There was no methodology for teaching English as a second language; the recognition that special techniques were required for teaching English as a second language came thirty years after the law was passed. From 1953-57 the Board of Education conducted its first and only major study

---

10 Hageny, William J. Education Law--Handbook for School Boards Albany: New York State School Board Association, 1970.

of how to educate non-English-speaking Puerto Rican Children. At that time there were approximately 40,000 non-English-speaking Puerto Rican students as compared to 8,828 just five years before, and so The Puerto Rican Study was undertaken.[11]

This critical problem was viewed within the following context as stated in the main objectives of the study:[12]

1) What are the effective methods and materials for teaching English as a second language to Puerto Ricans?

2) What are the most effective techniques the school can promote to help the Puerto Rican adjust to the community?

3) Who are the Puerto Rican pupils in the New York City schools?

The question of how to educate these children became synonymous with how to teach them English. Alternative or comprehensive programs that would utilize the native language or a bilingual approach were alluded to but never considered in substance.

One of the main conclusions of this study was that a child will eventually learn more English if he is not put into a special class, or non-English grouping. If he is put into a mixed class with his peer group and given special instruction within this context, he will learn at a faster rate. This conclusion was in part substantiated by a Columbia Teachers College study undertaken for this committee which suggested that "stretching children to understand in the real setting has advantages for English mastery and personal adjustment."[13]

---

11 New York City Board of Education. The Puerto Rican Study 1953-1957.

12 Ibid., p. 44.

13 Ibid., p. 187.

Reference is made to an experiment in the Philippines which questions this conclusion:

> "..there is belief that initial instruction in the child's vernacular during the first school year with a gradual shift to English during the second school year does not retard the later learning of English and does contribute to a better adjustment of the pupil."[14]

This study suggested that this latter approach should be investigated further along with the child's need to maintain his knowledge of Spanish. What is surprising is The Puerto Rican Study's omission of any reference to an earlier study conducted by Columbia University in 1925 on the island of Puerto Rico. At that time English was required as the language of instruction in many elementary schools even though the native language was Spanish. The purpose of Columbia's study was to measure the performance in English and in Spanish; 69,000 tests were given. The results indicated that when instructed and tested in English the Puerto Rican children were retarded by comparison with children in the United States; when instructed and tested in Spanish the same Puerto Rican children scored "markedly superior" as compared to the U.S. group.[15]

During the course of The Puerto Rican Study the question was asked--"How do you teach Puerto Rican pupils who cannot read English?"[16] To answer this question, a very limited program was organized to teach science in the Junior High Schools with the emphasis on experimentation and demonstration in using Spanish and English. The results were two science guidebooks to be used with language learners and the

---

14 Ibid., p. 1001.

15 Anderson, op. cit., p. 52.

16 The Puerto Rican Study, op. cit., p. 70.

conclusion was: "The principles and procedures guiding the development of the materials herein reported might profitably be employed at different grade levels and in other subject areas to open wider the doorway to science for non-English-speaking pupils."[17] There was no follow-through on this conclusion until ten years later and then only in the subject of science.

The Puerto Rican Study stated that "knowledge of Spanish is useful but not essential to successful teaching of English to Spanish-speaking children" and never considered the use of the Spanish language for instructional purposes in other subjects.[18] The use of Spanish was regarded as an important function of the Substitute Auxiliary Teacher (later called Bilingual Teacher in School and Community Relations). The Study recognized the need for some staff members to speak Spanish, but delineated their role to that of a liaison with the parents, teachers and pupils. They could give advice, translate, screen and test pupils. Though "teacher" is in their title, they do not serve as classroom teachers or give any instruction. The largest group of bilingual personnel in the educational system at that time, functioned mainly in advisory and guidance capacities.[19]

This was an important contribution of The Puerto Rican Study along with the suggestions of techniques and materials to be used in teaching

---

17 Ibid., p. 59.

18 Ibid., p. 96.

19 Ibid., p. 204.

English as a second language. This Study can be criticized for many limitations, but it was an extremely significant document. At least it was an attempt to formulate a solution to the problem, but, more importantly, it recommended many areas for further study and did not consider its findings to be the final solution. Twenty-three suggestions were made for further "lines of attack". References in the study indicated that Puerto Ricans would probably become assimilated by the third generation as had other immigrant groups in the past, but the Study concluded that this was too long a period to wait and used forceful language: "...to achieve such acceleration will require a unified attack on many fronts." Of 23 suggestions, their first two were as follows:

1) Accept The Puerto Rican Study, not as something finished, but as the first stage of a larger, city-wide, ever improving program for the education and assimilation of non-English-speaking children.

2) Take a new look at the philosophy governing the education of non-English children...Does his education involve helping him to forget the language of his fathers? Does it involve creation of barriers between him and his parents?

---

20 Ibid., p. 237

Policies and Practices 1957-1967

What did the Board of Education do in the decade following The Puerto Rican Study when by 1967 the Puerto Rican student population had increased to 243,739 and the number of non-English-speaking children totaled 110,447?

The basic policy of "English only" continued for instructional purposes. In the mixed classroom the teacher had some new materials and methods with which to teach English as a second language when she had time available from other subjects and other children. In addition, the practice continued of discouraging and often prohibiting the use of Spanish for any purpose except as a foreign language course. Children were often reprimanded and scolded for "chattering away" in their native tongue. Many classroom teachers were forbidden by their supervisors to use Spanish and have stated how they had to close the door so the principal could not hear them and see that this rule was being broken.

In 1963, Dr. Calvin Gross, then Superintendent of Schools, "urged that Puerto Rican children and other new arrivals to the city be able to develop biculturally and bilinguistically..."[22] In 1965 the Board issued a policy statement that "bilingualism and biculturalism will be encouraged for all pupils, particularly Spanish-speaking ones, as an aspect of excellence which will benefit our community and nation in their relationship to a multi-cultural world."[23] In 1967, Dr. Bernard Donovan,

---

21 New York City Board of Education. "Survey of Pupils Who Have Difficulties with the English Language." Publication No. 334, (P.N.S. 405).

22 New York Times, May 1963

23 New York City Board of Education. "Excellence for the Schools and New York City," Statement of Policy, April 13, 1965.

Superintendent of Schools, testified before the House General Subcommittee on Education: "We are dedicated to the bilingual approach of this educational program (Title VII hearings). Although we stress the importance of full command of the English Language, we also believe in the maintenance and strengthening of the child's skills in the native tongue of the pupil or his parents. Bilingual programs can provide superior educational benefits."[24] These statements made by leaders within the Board were rarely translated into viable policies or mandated as programs in the schools. An example of a positive effort made by the administration to implement this policy was the Science Program for the Junior High Schools.

In 1964, a second study was undertaken by the Board of Education to determine the educational effects of bilingual instruction in science for Junior High School Students of Spanish-speaking background. This three-year study was organized to:[25]

> Teach science bilingually--Spanish and English were used by the teacher and students interchangeably. Teachers were not always bilingual. NE coordinators would help and sometimes the students would translate. Materials were in both languages.

The conclusions of this study, published in 1967, are reviewed below:[26]

1) In the bilingual class and Spanish class the student's achievement was "positively affected." In his other courses which were taught in English, this was not the case.

---

24 New York City Board of Education. "Science Instruction in Spanish for pupils of Spanish-speaking Background." (Excerpted from Congressional Hearings), 1967, p. 7.

25 Sanguinetti, Carmen; Raisner, Arnold; and Bolger, Philip. "Science Instruction in Spanish for Pupils of Spanish-speaking Background: An experiment in Bilingualism." (Project No. 2370), U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Bureau of Research, 1967, p. 14.

26 Ibid., pp. 106-107.

2) "Superior classroom performance of experimental classes, however, was found primarily in schools having fluent Spanish-speaking teachers."

3) The students excelled in learning Spanish. They had been classified as two years below grade level based upon English reading ability and thus would have been ineligible to study a foreign language in Junior High School--in this case their own language.

4) "In the area of English, it was noted that the common fear that bilingual education would result in a diminuation in English language ability was not substantiated. In the area of classroom achievement, the experimentals did as well as the controls and in the area of English reading ability they did much better than the controls. THERE SEEMS TO BE SOME JUSTIFICATION FOR THE CONTENTION THAT MASTERY OF ONE LANGUAGE HAS A TRANSFER EFFECT UPON ANOTHER LANGUAGE."

5) Students tended to use Spanish more frequently than the controls but this was accompanied by general improvement in English, mentioned above.

6) There were definite decreases in anxiety, in general, and towards tests.

7) Experimentals retained more of the parental culture; thus, it increased the bond between child and home.

Though these conclusions illustrated the effectiveness of bilingual instruction, the program expanded only at a very modest rate. To date, the Science Spanish Program includes 2,000 children out of a population of 14,350 non-English, Spanish-speaking Junior High School students. The results of this report have not been applied to other subjects or other grade levels.

Policies and Practices--1967 to June 1971

Ten years after The Puerto Rican Study, the policy of "stretching the child" was empirically invalidated by the evidence of failure in the classroom. In addition, the existence of successful experiments in bilingual education, such as the Science-Spanish program and the Coral Way school in Miami, added to this accumulating evidence. The Puerto Rican community brought pressure for new methods and programs which resulted in the report entitled, "The Design for the Improvement of Educational Opportunities for Puerto Rican Pupils in New York Schools."[27] Their recommendations included reception classes, more intensive English language instruction by trained teachers, better diagnostic scales for measuring ability in English and Spanish, recruitment of bilingual teachers, establishment of bilingual instructional programs and many other improvements. The report issued by the Division of Instructional Services a year later was strongly criticized by members of the Puerto Rican community, as they claimed it indicated a lack of direction and responsibility for any of the programs for the Puerto Rican Child. They maintained that there was no serious evaluation or discussion of the program in the Division's report, merely a listing of various activities, many of which relate to all children in the school system.[28] The most serious complaint was that few

---

27 Design for the Improvement of Educational Opportunities, May 1969.

28 New York City Board of Education, "Implementation of the Design for the Improvement of Educational Opportunities for Puerto Rican Pupils in New York City Schools, May, 1969

of the recommendations of the report were ever implement.

The Administration conducted studies such as the Science program and surveys of pupils with English language difficulties. Efforts were made and were successful in licensing Teachers of English as a Second Language and increasing the number as well as reorganizing some programs of instruction.

A comprehensive study of programs for the non-English-speaking child was undertaken by a community organization, the Puerto Rican Forum, as they concluded that no follow-up to the Puerto Rican Study had been conducted.

The Forum investigated the programs for teaching English as a Second Language and concluded that only one out of every four NE students receives any help in English language instruction.[29]

The following table from the Forum's report summarizes their study of 97 schools with a high concentration of NE's in which they concluded that 74% of the children received no help.[30]

---

29 Greenspan, Richard. "The Education of the Puerto Rican Child" (Unpublished report prepared for the Puerto Rican Forum, 1970).

30 Ibid., p. 91.

No. of Non-English-Speaking Pupils Receiving Help with their Language Problems

Date for 97 Schools in New York City in January 1970

	Number of Schools	Number of NE Pupils	Receiving Help No.	Receiving Help Percent	Not Receiving Help No.	Not Receiving Help Percent
Elementary	81	31,445	6,983	22.2%	24,462	77.8
Junior H.S.	11	2,680	959	34.0	1,721	64.0
Academic	5	3,333	1,705	51.0	1,628	49.0
	97	37,458	9,647	25.8	27,811	74.2

With regard to the Board's policy of 30 minutes per day of English language instruction for all NE children, they found that the maxium number of Puerto Rican students receiving this moderate amount of instruction was 10,000 out of a total of at 88,157 Puerto Rican children classified as NE. The problem of no service or inadequate service to the NE student has reached major proportions, receiving the attention of Senator Javit's office which has been investigating many of the Forum's findings through its own research. Their summary "reinforces the Forum's conclusions."[31]

---

31 Dennis Alle & Manuel del Valle, (Memorandum for Senator Javits) Instruction for Non-English-Speaking Puerto Rican Pupils in the New York City Public School System. February 10, 1971

Programs for NE children vary considerably throughout the school system. The kind of program often depends upon the attitude and philosophy of the principal, and he then organizes his priorities and resources accordingly. A majority of the schools continue with the mixed class concept modified in many schools by reception or NE classes. The children usually remain in the special class for one year and then go into the mainstream without any adequate testing to determine their proficiency in English. Usually the pressure of incoming NE's is the deciding factor in moving a child into the "mainstream" and not his comprehension of English. Spanish is sometimes used as the language of instruction in this class, but more often it is limited to translating the lessons which are presented in English. The amount of English language instruction in the mixed classes does not follow a consistent pattern, nor is it related to the child. It is often dependent upon how the principal allocates space and teachers. Children are sometimes pulled out for small group instruction in daily periods, but more often once or twice a week. The Board's policy of 30 minutes of English language instruction daily is far from any degree of reasonable implementation. In addition, even if this amount were consistently programmed, it would be considered inadequate by many of the teachers involved in the education of non-English-speaking children.

Bilingual Education is and has been, at most, a moderate experimental program within the New York City educational system.

A cursory review of the data on programs for NE children supports the contention that what is needed is a major reconsideration and restructuring of present programs.

Based upon the 1969 Survey of Pupils Who Have Difficulties with the English Language, there are 46,277 NE children classified as having "severe language difficulty."[32] If these children were to participate in the supposedly current program of English language instruction of a period a day in groups of 10 or 12, at least 925 trained Teachers of English as a Second Language would be needed. For the other group 75,456 children who are classified as having a "moderate language difficulty," a program of 1 period a day in groups of 25 would require at least another 750 teachers. To implement a moderate program of English language instruction, 1,675 Teachers of English as a Second Language are required. There are currently 203 Teachers of English as a Second Language.

There are 105,482 Spanish-speaking children who are classified as having a language difficulty. For this group alone, 1,000 Teachers

---

32 New York City Board of Education. "Survey of Pupils Who Have Difficulties with the English Language." Publication No. 334 (P.N.S. 408), 1970.

of English as a Second Language would be needed for a modest program of one period a day in classes of 25.

According to a Board of Education memo dated February 23, 1971, a request was made in the 1971-72 budget for an increase of 120 elementary, 40 junior high school, and 30 academic high school Teachers of English as a Second Language--a total of 190 Teachers of English as a Second Language when the need is for more than 1,000.

The Teachers of English as a Second Language program is of extreme importance, and yet the resources allocated for such programs are inadequate to meet the critical needs.

The question of how these children are being taught while they are in the process of learning English can also be answered by the number of teachers servicing NE's. Accurate information on the number of Spanish-speaking teachers presently working in the public schools was unabailable. The following summary is the best estimate that could be obtained from available figures.

According to the Board of Education's Personnel Census of 1969, there are 645 teachers of Puerto Rican and Hispanic background, though not necessarily Spanish-speaking. This number includes 209 Bilingual

---

33 New York City Board of Education, Office of Personnel. "Ethnic Distribution of Licensed Teaching Staff by District for the Month of March 1969." (Computer Data Sheets), pp. 1-2.

Teachers in School and Community Relations who do not teach in the classroom: the number of instructional personnel is approximately 436. Since this census, and as of June, 1971, the program for the Recruitment and Training of Spanish-speaking Teachers has successfully prepared about 231 teachers for licensing--77% of whom are working in public schools with a high concentration of Spanish-speaking children. This total of 767 may not include some per diem teachers hired through the district offices and also some of the 184 bilingual teachers of bilingual programs. No information is available on the number of non-Hispanic teachers who speak Spanish. Based upon the above categories, we will use an estimate of 800 classroom teachers of Hispanic background.

If the 105,402 Spanish-speaking children with English language difficulty were organized into classes of 25 for bilingual instruction for a limited period or into an extensive program, at least 4,200 Bilingual teachers would be needed, and we have approximately 800.

The Puerto Rican Educational Policies Committee pressured for the establishment of programs to meet the needs of non-English-speaking children. The Program for the Recruitment and Training of Spanish-speaking Teachers was organized in 1968 with funds from Title I to meet the need for thousands of bilingual teachers; yet allocated funds limit their efforts to recruiting and training 200 new candidates each year—small number compared to the 4,200 mentioned above as a moderate estimate of Spanish-speaking teachers required for bilingual programs.

Since 1969 administrators within the school system and community organizations have worked towards and brought about the establishment of new licenses for bilingual teachers: Bilingual Common Branches and Bilingual Early Childhood.

According to a memo from the Chairman of the Board of Examiners, dated February, 1971, 328 candidates took the first examination for Bilingual licenses. This memo maintains that the examination will result in "hundreds of licensed bilingual teachers." The results of the examinations were "145 passed the Bilingual Common Branches and Bilingual Early Childhood examinations. Many of those who passed are already licensed as substitute teachers and working in classrooms. What is the policy or what priorities are there for appointing this group of critically needed teachers. This memo concludes: "Budgetary considerations will decide the numbers to be appointed."

This discussion has not included over 150,000 Puerto Rican students who qualify as English-speaking although their knowledge of English is only functional. Most of them have difficulty with the English language, but they are put into regular classrooms--where their English language problems are never responded to, and their use of Spanish is discouraged and eventually forgotten. The performance of Puerto Rican students in the school system as summarized in Appendix "A" is the poorest in the entire New Yirk City public school system. Their reading scores are the lowest of any other group, and their drop-out rate and truancy level are the highest of any group.

It seems imperative that the school system respond to this crisis with greater efforts. Present programs are inadequate and fail to meet the increasing exigencies of the Spanish-speaking population in the school system.

III

BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN THE NEW YORK CITY SCHOOL SYSTEM

Before this report was completed there was no comprehensive information on what kinds of bilingual programs existed in New York City or where many of the programs were located. An objective of this report was to provide the data.

The term "bilingual" is currently used to describe a wide variety of programs in the elementary and junior high schools. There were no programs designated as such among the high schools for the past school year. Programs which use bilingual in their title, or project description, or were indexed under this heading in State and Federal directories were reviewed for this report, as well as various departmental lists that were incomplete.

State and Federal programs can be classified into seven categories: (See Appendix "C")

1) Bilingual Schools--a separate school has been organized to achieve "functional Bilingualism" for English and non-English-speaking children.

2) Bilingual Track--within a regular school, classes have been organized at every grade level to provide a complete bilingual program.

3) Bilingual Classes--one or two grades have been organized to teach all subjects in Spanish and English and each year the program will expand until there is a complete bilingual track.

4) Bilingual Instruction is a Subject Area--Spanish and English used as the language of instruction for science in the Junior High School.

5) Non-English Class--Spanish is used as the language of instruction for 1 year and then the children go into the mainstream of mixed classes.

6) Spanish Language Arts--for English and non-English-speaking children.

7) Teaching English--as a second language (TESL)

These seven categories illustrate that bilingual education as defined by the practices in the New York City public schools includes almost any program for the non-English-speaking child. This is also apparent in conversations with teachers, principals, and administrators who have often used the term bilingual when referring to any program directed toward helping non-English children learn English.

There are no policy positions, general definitions or guidelines at the local and state levels, comparable to the federal government's, which provides the only official educational position on bilingual education. Under Title VII, Bilingual Education is defined as:

> "The use of two languages, one of which is English, as mediums of instruction for the same pupil population in a well-organized program which encompasses part or all of the curriculum and includes the study of the history and culture associated with the mother tongue. A complete program develops and maintains the children's self-esteem and a legitimate pride in both cultures."[34]

Using this definition as the basis for determining which programs in New York City are providing bilingual education, we find that the first three categories, bilingual school, bilingual track and

---

34 Draft Guidelines to the Bilingual Education Program, p. 1.

bilingual classes fall within this description. The other categories are components and offer important services for the non-English child but they are not bilingual programs under this definition.

The date (see Appendix C) indicates that there are bilingual programs (categories 1-3) in 37 schools covering a student population of 4,418. Two programs started in 1968, three were added in 1969, and 32 in 1970. Though it would appear that a major effort was made in 1970, this impression is offset by the small increase in Spanish-speaking students included in new programs. Prior to 1970 there were 2,086 Spanish-speaking students in five programs, and in 1970 though 32 programs began they involved only 2,332 students. Most of these new programs are one-year programs which will expand each year into a complete elementary track, but, as yet, they are not comphensive or well-structured programs.

The amount of money allocated for new programs under federal, state, and district funds was less in 1970 than the amount allocated for existing programs in 1969. The amount of money from federal and state sources in 1970 totaled $1,645,474. Title VII contributed the major portion of the sum-$1,250,106; Title I--$233,249 and SUE--$162,119.[35]

Of the 37 programs in existence, the most comprehensive programs are P.S. 25 and P.S. 211 in the Bronx which are bilingual schools on the elementary level.

---

35 Data on sums in Appendix "C".

Community pressure and educational leadership in District 7 of the Bronx brought about the formation of the first New York City public bilingual school, P.S. 25, in September of 1963. In an old school building scheduled for demolition, a fairly well-integrated program of instruction, teacher training, parent participation and curriculum development was organized to meet the objectives of bilingual education. The program started out with district funds and then received Title VII monies in 1969 as one of two programs sponsored by the Bilingual Education Act.

The children of P.S. 25 are primarily from Spanish-speaking backgrounds however, 16% are Black children with no knowledge of Spanish, whose parents have expressed interest in the school. All participation is voluntary.

Classes are organized according to English language dominance and Spanish language dominance, and instruction is provided in curriculum areas and language arts according to ability. For instance, a child who speaks no English would start with 95% of his instruction in Spanish and the remaining 5% in English. As he progresses in the second language, the amount increases until he is receiving half of his instruction in his native language and the other half in English. The language pattern is reversed for the child who speaks no Spanish. Subjects in the two languages alternate from year to year.

The objective is "to offer students, both English and Spanish, an opportunity to develop functional bilingualism...equal proficiency in understanding, speaking, reading and writing both English and Spanish." There is no didactic approach as to how this objective can be filfilled. The classrooms have a very creative atmosphere. The directors have the attitude that many facets are involved in reaching their objective and that they are in the process of learning the ways--but not just one way.

A formal evaluation has not yet been published but the program is evaluated and audited by two different isntitutions. Teacher tests indicate that the program is succeeding; the following are some indications: Attendance rarely drops below 90%; in the first year 96% of the children returned to the program; in the 2nd year 98% returned--those who did not had emigrated to Puerto Rico. Children who were getting 5% English language arts in kindergarten are now getting 25% in the first grade. Some children in the 5th grade went to the school classified as slow learners, as they could not read in either language and they are now doing very well. When the assistant director was asked by a member of the visiting group about their procedures for disciplinary problems, everyone was surprised when the comment was--none. To date, they have not had any disciplinary problems. Children, parents, and teachers seem to participate in this program with great enthusiasm.

---

36 Comments based upon information obtained during interviews at P.S. 25 with the Principal and Assistant Principal.

In 1969 a bilingual system which is quite different was established in P.S. 211 in a converted factory building in the Bronx. This elementary school is composed of 50% Spanish-speaking children and 50% Black children. They are organized into non-graded groups within an open-corridor arrangement. Bilingual instruction is given within a more flexible, individualized setting. Small cluster groups advance in different subjects at their own pace. The district provided the funds for this program, and some additional money was received from State Urban Education Funds.

The remaining bilingual programs are tracks within the regular school or classes which will expand into complete tracks within 5 years. Some of these programs are as follows:

P.S. 155 was one of the earliest programs in New York City, starting in 1968. They have bilingual classes at all grade levels for the Spanish-speaking children and Spanish language arts for anyone in the school who wants to participate. P.S. 155 has the most informal arrangement regarding language instruction as English and Spanish are used interchangeably.

P.S. 96 has a bilingual class at every level but instruction is more formalized. Both English and Spanish are used within specified instructional periods.

P.S. 1, 'Building Bilingual Bridges,' is a program primarily for Chinese children and the only significant bilingual program for non-Spanish-speaking students. There are 148 Chinese children, 50 Puerto Rican children, and 21 English dominant children in P.S. 1. In this program there is more emphasis on intensive English instruction and reading readiness with math being taught in the native language.

The pattern in the bilingual classes tends to follow the English dominant Spanish-dominant organization of P.S. 25 with gradual increases in instruction in both languages.

There are many other patterns in programs throughout the country; however, for the purposes of this review--the methods of materials being used have not been evaluated. Hopefully, this complex and inportant subject will be studied in the near future.

Most of the bilingual programs are oriented towards the Spanish-speaking child. P.S. 211 is the only program that has half of the students' population English-dominant and non-Spanish. P.S. 25 had 16% and most of the others are completely Spanish-dominant or Spanish-speaking.

IV

FUNDING FOR BILINGUAL PROGRAMS

The major federal program which provides educational assistance is Title I E.S.E.A. which last year allocated $125 million to New York City. Funds are to be used for direct services to educationally deprived children who are poor. Districts receive their allocations from the New York City Board of Education according to a formula based upon the number of families classified on a poverty level. Programs are prepared and submitted to the State for approval.

There are no guidelines or priorities for bilingual education under Title I. The emphasis is on remedial and supplementary services which cover a wide range of activities. One program for 600 pregnant high school girls reveived more money under Title I than bilingual programs funded by Title I.

According to a list from the Division of Funded Programs, there were "bilingual components" in 14 districts which included public and non-public schools. Of the 14 components listed, only 2 programs provide bilingual instruction. The remaining 12 programs provide services for non-English-speaking children such as Teachers of English as a Second Language, bilingual assistants, and Bilingual Teachers in School and Community Relations.

The Districts received $88 million out of the $125 million allocated to the City, and $227,595 was spent for the 2 bilingual programs while

the other NE programs received $980.508. The districts are not allocating any significant portion of the millions they receive for bilingual programs even though there are high concentration of Puerto Rican children in many of them.

The largest program funded by Title I in 1970-71 which supports bilingual education, is the central program for the Recruitment and Training of Spanish-speaking Teachers, which received $1,047,549 out of $26.6 million allocated to the Central Board. Yet the funds allocated to this program limit their recruiting activities to accepting 200 new candidates each year for their training seminars and college tuition programs, although the need is for thousands.

Recently the federal government has questioned the use of Title I funds for t training program and it required extensive efforts on the part of officials at the Board of Education to maintain this program. Though they were successful for the coming year, serious problems exist for future recycling.

Title I funds could be a major resource for bilingual grograms as Title I is the federal government's main program. But unless bilingual education is specified as a priority, it seems it will receive only token amounts, or no amounts.

Title VII

In 1969 the federal government allocated $6.5 million for bilingual programs under Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Of this sum New York City received $363,203 for two programs--P.S. 25 a bilingual school in the Bronx which had been in operation for one year supported by the district; and P.S. 1 in Manhattan, a new program established for Chinese and Spanish-speaking children on the PK to 1st grade level.

When a comparison is made of the distribution of $6.5 million throughout the United States, the conclusion is that the federal government gave major support to bilingual programs in two states--California and Texas. In the first year of title VII, Texas received almost three times as much money and five times as many programs as New York City. California received five times as much money and eight times as many programs as New York, The single, largest funded and most extensive program is a PK to 12th grade school in Chula Vista, California. One PK program in Santa Ana received more money than The P.S. 25 bilingual school in New York. (See Appendices "E" - "K")

Complete details for 1970-71 programs were not available, but the distribution of money indicates that California and Texas continue to receive the dominant share of funds. Though the total amount of Title VII funds was substantially increased from $6 million to $30 million in 1970, New York City recived $1.2 million and again Texas and California maintained their proportionately larger share of $5 and $7 million respectively.

Four new programs were funded this past year, three on the elementary level and one on the 7th and 8th grade level. To date, there are no bilingual programs in the high schools in New York even though seven other states have had high school programs funded by Title VII since 1969. (See Appendices "E" - "K") Does any high school in the country have the concentration of non-English-speaking students

that exists in New York City? Why has New York received 1 million out of $23 million; six programs out of hundreds; one comprehensive bilingual program as compared to many other extensive programs in other states?

The Federal Government does not have a formula, geographic or other, by which monies are distributed. According to information obtained in an interview with a representative from the Washington Office, the allocation of funds is extremely competitive and vulnerable to political pressure. The number of Spanish-speaking children or other non-English-speaking children is not the basic criterion, and the density of this population is not correlated with the amounts distributed.

Why has New York City received a disproportionate share of Title VII monies? We were told by a Title VII representative that committees from Texas and California have been far more organized, visible, and voluble in the Washington Office. Compared to New York, these states submit many more proposals; thus, the number is a form of pressure, but, also, the programs are more innovative and better thought out. The local and state educational agencies are more actively involved in helping to prepare proposals and in exerting pressure to get them accepted. For Example, in 1970 the three states we are comparing submitted the following proposals:

California	181
Texas	88
New York	48

One of the priorities of Title VII is to find new and creative

approaches to bilingual education. They do not fund programs because they are critically needed; that is funds are not allocated on the basis of the density of non-English-speaking children in a specific school or area, or on the basis of poor performance in a school or area. Programs are funded which propose well-organized and innovative designs. They are seeking a variety of approaches that will make a constribution towards meeting the needs of non-English-speaking children in different situations.

At the Central Board of Education there is an office which processes Title VII applications. This office does not have the resources to provide enough information and guidance to community school districts on the organization of proposals or program designs. The districts and individuals concerned with writing Title VII proposals have expressed the need for assistance and information from an office such as this. No central source of information exists about bilingual programs in New York which could provide a background for those concerned with writing program designs. As innovative programs receive priority in the Title VII guidelines, information and guidance would be a valuable function for some designated central office.

For the forthcoming year, $25 million is being discussed as the total allocation; of that sum, $1 million is for new programs throughout the country and $25 million for existing programs. New priorities were also announced which would give preference to programs in districts with a high concentration of migrant workers and Indians or school which are in the process of desegregation. This would almost definitely have excluded New York City. A joint response and effort by the Puerto Rican community and New York City school system influenced the Washington office to modify these guidelinesss.

New York State funds

The State Legislature in 1968 provided for the funding of programs for the inner-city child and his educational needs resulting from poverty. Two separate programs were established: Quality Incentive Programs (QIP) to correct and to improve existing educational and cultural programs in the schools, and Community Education Centers (CEC) to supplement regular classroom activities with community based projects.

The guidelines and priorities for both programs are such that bilingual educational programs could be substantiated as meeting the needs of the inner-city child under several of the priorities: Early Childhood Education, Basic Skills Education, Model Demonstration Programs.

Under the CEC, of which there are 11 centers, some bilingual programs are sponsored. The most important is the bilingual school P.S. 211 previously mentioned, which is receiving funds for supportive services under CEC. Another significant program is P.S. 96 which has a bilingual track within the regular elementary school. Both of these programs received a total of approximately $162,000 out of $14.3 million allocated in 1970-71.

Two other programs listed in the current directory of projects are called bilingual. One program provides bilingual instruction until sufficient English is mastered, and then the student goes into the mainstream. The other is a bilingual program in 3 schools for 250 children. Fourteen bilingual teachers are used to provide Spanish pupils with the opportunity to develop functional bilingualism. The project was started in 1968 and today there are no bilingual classes. The acting coordinator talks about some mobile language labs (buses) which have not yet arrived and the evaluation describes the program as "not fully operational."

The QIP received $3 million for 1970-71, but their programs are not involved with bilingual instructional projects. Here, again, though the phrase "bilingual" may be used, the program involves Spanish-speaking children but no bilingual instruction. One of the largest funded programs is $1 million for a Teachers of English as a Second Language Project in the high schools. Approximately $300,000 is for Teachers of English as Second Language in the districts, and

about #100,00 is distributed among programs of conversational Spanish, Hispanic heritage courses, and salaries for Bilingual Educational Assistants. Most of the funded programs are for small amounts and cover a broad variety of activities.

District Funds

District funds are used in all existing bilingual programs. Many of these programs, however, could not be continued if they were not supplemented by federal or state funds. According to many school administrators, programs are desperately needed in many schools, but they will never be initiated unless additional funds are forthcomong.

During the past year, there were two programs completely supported by district funds. Many exponents of bilingual education, including the principals of P.S. 25 and P.S. 155 who were the first to experiment with such programs, maintain that additional funds are not essential. If the interest and commitment to this approach are there, programs can be established by re-allocating present resources.

The Puerto Rican community has been suggesting and pressuring for an Office of Bilingual Instruction which would coordinate existing programs and department and give some guidance and direction towards the establishment of additional programs. This Office was to begin functioning in September 1971 and, hopefully, efforts will be made to utilize existing resources as well as obtain and equitable share of state and federal funds for bilingual instruction.

V

RATIONALE FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Exponents of bilingual education maintain that it is a sounder pedagogical approach, that it has psycholigical and practical benefits for the child, and that it provides society with a valuable resource.

There is increasing evidence to support the pedagogical argument that the native language of a child is a better medium of learning. A child's knowledge and readiness are utilized while his attitudes and motivation towards learning are developed in a more positive manner if his language is appreciated instead of prohibited. In 1953, UNESCO published a monograph which states: 'It is axiomatic that the best medium for teaching a child is his mother tongue.[37] Later, Title VII recognized, as a matter of policy, that learning in one's native language helps to prevent retardation. Many studies throughout the world corroborate this theory.

One of the earliest studies was the Columbia Teachers College Study of 1925 which was previously mentioned. The Summer Institute of Linguistics has been working for over 20 years with different language groups throughout the western hemisphere, and their experience supports the contention that reading and writing in the first language should precede any introduction of a second language.[38] Experiments in the

---

37 UNESCO. 'The Use of the Vernacular en Education.' Paris, UNESCO, 1953

38 Anderson, op. cit., p. 44

Philippines in the 1940's confirm this conclusion as well as more recent studies conducted by NYU in Mexico.[39] The results published in 1968 indicated that learning to read in the language one knows is easier than having to learn both reading and a new language.[40]

It is difficult to find studies which concur with The Puerto Rican Study's conclusion that "stretching the child" in the mixed classroom is a sound approach to teaching the non-English-speaking child. Underlying the "English only" method is the argument that a second language (the native language) and, thus, two languages in the educational process is a burden for the child to contend with, which brings us to some of the arguments against bilingual education. It was often thought that in the early years a child was not capable of coping with two languages. As a result, foreign language teaching in our school system is often delayed until junior or senior high schools and then is offered only to those students who are achieving the highest grades. There are studies which conclude that there is a correlation between bilingualism and language difficulties such as stuttering, or between bilingualism and intelligence scores.[41] Bruce Gaarder, a

---

39 The Puerto Rican Study, op,, p. 100

40 Modiano, Nancy. "National or Mother Tongue in Reading: A Comparative Study," Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. II, No. 1 1968 p. 43.

41 Darcy, Natalie T. "Bilingualism and the Measurement of Intelligence: Review of a Decade of Research." The Journal of Generic Psychology. Vol. CIII, Dec, 1963

Jensen, J. Vernan. "Effects of Childhood Bilingualism," Elementary English. Vol. 30, February 1962 and April 1962.

leading authority on this subject, has written: 'Many researchers have established a decided correlation between bilingualism and low marks on intelligence tests, but what no research has shown is that bilingualism, per se, is a cause of low performance on intelligence tests.' Studies which take all factors into consideration show that it is not bilingualism but how and to what extent and under what conditions the two languages are taught that makes the difference.[42]

The relationship of bilingualism to intelligence was studied in Montreal, Canada. Psychologists Lambert and Peale found that when children had developed literacy in two languages and were truly bilingual, they scored higher on verbal and non-verbal examinations than monolingual children in the control group. The bilingual children also seemed to be more varied in their mental qualities. They concluded that 'variables such as socioeconomic status, attitude toward the two langugges, and educational policy and practice regarding the teaching of both langugges' were all factors in previous studies which related bilingualism to low performance on tests.[43] The most obvious non-scientific confirmation of this conclusion is the fact that the affluent elite throughout the world value and benifit from bilingualism.

In addition to the benefits of utilizing a child's native language

---

42 Anderson, op. cit., p. 51

43 Anderson, loc. cit.

as a teaching medium while teaching him a second language, there are psycholigical and economic advantages in a system which continues the mother tongue even after the English language has been mastered. When a child's language is rejected and prohibited at any state, this can become the basis for feelings of inferiority. The child can interpret it as a rejection of himself, his family, and all that is familiar to him. On the other hand, if his language and culture are appreciated and utilized in the educational process, it will enhance his self-image and reinforce his relationship with his family and the society of which he forms a part. Instead of experiencing rejection and ridicule because he speaks another language and is different, the child's native language would be viewed as a skill to be maintained and developed.

The retention of the native language would also provide the child with a practical advantage later on in the economic arena. His ability to become literate in two languages would be used instead of wasted and ignored. Business opportunities on all levels--from bilingual typist to managerial positions--are increasingly available for Spanish-speaking graduates. Language skills would be a decided asset in the job market.

Today, America is integrally involved in a multi-lingual, multi-cultural world. The resources of language and culture should be developed within a bilingual educational system. An

understanding and appreciation of ethnic differences in our own society would contribute to an awareness and sensitivity in our relations with other countires. The role of the Puerto Rican and other Spanish-speaking groups is a good example. America could benefit from their language skills and relationship with Latin America's heritage, where they could function in a wide variety of diplomatic positions.

And, finally, the rationale for bilingual education which stands independently of all the above considerations is that the Spanish-speaking and other communities want it as an alternative to the present educational system. If special schools are established for a variety of reasons in our present system--for the intelligent, for the retarded, for those who want to learn a trade, etc.--then why not for those who want to maintain their language and culture?

VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Bilingual education is not a new concept in our educational system. There are historical precedents which began before the public school system was organized and which continued in the private and public schools until the 20th century. Historically, bilingual education was established when communities desired to maintain their language and culture and when our social system was flexible and open to such demands.

As America became more nationalistic and xenophobic, however, the objective of education became the Americanization of foreigners. This was implemented as a system which divested foreign children of thier language and culture. The policy of 'English only' is still widespread throughout the nation's educational establishments. Though many individuals prospred within such a system, there is increasing recognition today that great losses resulted from such practices. Many individuals whose failures are not recorded suffered unnecessarily. The languages and cultures of the diverse groups who settled here were vital resources which were ignored and wasted.

Bilingual education has been recognized on the federal level as a means of improving the education of non-English-speaking children by utilizing their native language and culture as positive qualities in the teaching process. Though the principle is recognized, the funds allocated are insufficient to cope with the immense need for bilingual programs.

Educational leaders have been establishing a pedagogical rationale and imperative for such programs. Psychologists, sociologists, and historians have been discussing the advantages for the individual and society. Ethnic communities are pressuring the establishment for a system which responds to their needs, which offers them the opportunity to maintain their language and culture, and which offers them the opportunity to receive an adequate education which will enable them to compete with the 'mainstreams' of society from which many groups have been excluded.

Present-day experiments in bilingual education are generally very successful throughout the country. The methods used and the organization of such programs are still being developed and studied. The specifics of such programs, e.g., materials and methods used and the organization of classes are all in experimental stages. Though there is no didactic approach, there is general agreement that the performance of children participating in well organized programs is impressive.

Some of the opposition to bilingual education results from a misunderstanding about the use of English in such programs. All exponents of bilingual education regard the teaching of English as an integral component of any bilingual program. English is never minimized for excluded; it is a part of the complete learning process, but the child is also learning his native language and subject matter simultaneously.

Bilingual education came late to New York City, and it has been limited to a few programs. Historically, there are no precedents within the present public school system because bilingual education was never provided when such opportunities existed for others in different cities. But, more importantly, today the educational establishment is far behind

other states in providing leadership and effective programs for the non-English-speaking population.

An educational crisis has existed in our schools for many years as one-fourth of the school population, the Puerto Rican children, have received the most inadequate education of any ethnic group. They have the highest drop-out-rate, the highest truancy level, and the lowest reading scores.

Since the 1950's there has been a continuous increase in the number of non-English-speaking children. The major response to this development occurred in 1955 when The Puerto Rican Study was undertaken to determine the best methods and materials to be used in teaching English as a Second Language. In subsequent years, there was never any evaluation of the conclusions and policy which resulted and there was never any implementation of very important recommendations.

The prevailing educational practice has been "English only" for subject matter instruction and the teaching of the English language in a variety of ways, depending upon how a principal organized his school, with the results that very few children receive any English language instruction; yet, this is the only policy the Board has clearly established. The data in this report illustrates neglect in implementing the only policy to which there has been some commitment. In 1971 we find the Bureau of English not initiating but agreeing to the State's suggestion that 30 minutes of English language instruction be mandated. There are no plans for providing the personnel for such programs and so the present system continues. The school system has not fulfilled its objective of providing English language instruction, and it has provided limited leadership in the area of bilingual education. At a time when educational leaders

and conferences were studying this solution in other states and programs were being organized in California, Texas, and Florida, we find that there were few bilingual programs in New York City. These came about with the urging and pressure of community leadership. There was little guidance or direction from educational administrators. To date, there is still no bilingual program in high schools which is under the central administration. Our educational institutions, i.e., City and State universities, have also failed to provide leadership or make any significant contribution to the question of how to educate the NE child. The limited number of courses or programs in New York colleges are listed in Appendix 'L' which clearly indicates that the recent response is limited.

When the Federal Government made limited resources available, the New York school system was not agressive. Requests for funds were processed but there was no concentrated effort to obtain funds or initiate innovative programs, specifically under Title VII. The results are that today bilingual programs are one of many small experimental projects in the New City school system without organized support and guidance from the central source of educational policy. Though bilingual programs have demonstrated impressive results, from the model school of P.S. 25 to the Spanish-Science program in the junior high schools, there are insufficient numbers of children participating in such programs, and the rate of expansion compared to the need is very meager. Over 100,00 non-English-speaking children, as well as many other thousands of children who are not classified as language learners, but have great difficulty, could benefit from such

programs. And, yet, last year only 2,000 children entered new programs bringing the total to 4,000. The sum of money allocated for new programs was less than that for existing programs. Federal, State and local educational officials should be criticized for not providing sufficient funds for bilingual education. Thus, the support that this educational innovation is receiving is only nominal.

The Puerto Rican community regards bilingual education as a major strategy to change the present conditions which are contributing to the failure of Puerto Rican children in the classroom. Many of the bilingual programs which exist today came about because of pressure from the Puerto Rican community who are now urging an Office of Bilingual Instruction. The most promising development in this education crisis is the forthcoming organization of such an office which will coordinate and direct all programs for non-English-speaking children and, hopefully, will provide a strategy to resolve the educational problems of these children.

Appendix "A"

DATA REGARDING THE PERFORMANCE OF THE PUERTO RICAN STUDENTS

READING SCORES

According to the ASPIRA report " . and Others" which analyzed data in 1969--in schools with predominantly Puerto Rican students:

70% in 2nd grade read below normal level
82% in 5th grade read below normal level
81% in 7th grade read below normal level

According to the Puerto Rican Forum's study in 1969:

76% of all Puerto Rican students are below the normal reading level

DROP-OUT RATE

Puerto Rican Students	57% Drop-out rate
Black Students	46% Drop-out rate
Others	29% Drop-out rate

No data is available at the Board of Education. Information was obtained from data in the Puerto Rican Forum's study from 1966 to 1967.

TRUANCY RATE

According to a New York Times study in 1970, high schools with a large percentage of Puerto Rican students have a higher truancy rate. Some of the schools are as follows:

Benjamin Franklin	45% Truancy Rate
Eastern District	42% Truancy Rate
Boys High	40% Truancy Rate

Appendix "B"

PUERTO RICAN AND NON-ENGLISH-SPEAKING STUDENT POPULATION INCREASE

Puerto Rican Student Population Increase Since 1955

	1955	1965	1967-70
Total Number	102,554	209,982	250.000

Non-English-Speaking Student Population Increase Since 1955

Total Number	50 000	92,706	121,733*

*105,402 are Spanish-speaking

Appendix "C"

1970-71 PROGRAMS FOR NON-ENGLISH-SPEAKING CHILDREN THAT ARE CALLED BILINGUAL

1. BILINGUAL SCHOOL

District	School	Source of Funds	Total Amount	Year	Number of Students	Number of Bilingual Teachers
6	P.S. 192 Minischool	Title I	$ 71,249	1970	300	7
7	P.S. 25	Title VII	308,972	1968	900	42
12	P.S.211	SUE	95,000	1969	650	38

2. BILINGUAL TRACK (sub-school) within regular school (grades K-6)

District	school	Source of Funds	Total Amount	Year	Number of Students	Number of Bilingual Teachers
4	P.S. 96	SUE	67,119	1969	125	5
	J.H.S.45	Title VII	91,301	1970	110	4
6	P.S.192	District	?	1970	200	6
23	P.S.155	District	?	1969	102	6

3. BILINGUAL CLASSES (Early grades--expanding each year into full program.)

District	School	Source of Funds	Total Amount	Year	Number of Students	Number of Bilingual Teachers
2	P.S.1	Title VII	191,974	1969	219	4
2	P.S.199	Title VII Project Best	*107,549	1970	90	3
?	P.S.9	Title I	162,000	1970	450	21
	P.S.75					
	P.S.84					
	P.S.87					
	P.S.145					
	P.S.163					
	P.S.165					
	P.S.166					
	P.S.179					
	P.S.191					

3. BILINGUAL CLASSES (continued)

District	School	Source of Funds	Total Amount	Year	Number of Students	Number of Bilingual Teachers
4	P.S.109	Title VII	Project* Best	1970	25	1
	P.S.155				75	3
7	P.S.1	Title VII	Project* Best	1970	21	1
	P.S.40				24	1
	P.S.157				23	1
9	P.S.4	Title VII	Project* Best		125	4
	P.S.42				100	4
	P.S.53				100	4
	P.S.90				100	4
	P.S.109				100	4
12	P.S.47	Title VII	Project* Best		48	2
	P.S.50				41	2
	P.S.61				52	2
	P.S.66				62	2
	P.S.67				54	2
13	P.S.133	Title VII	$ 139,531		50	2
	P.S.282				50	2
14	P.S.122 Pre-School		147 322		80	3
TOTALS For categories 1, 2 and 3			$1,382,017		4,410	Information on Teachers Incomplete

*Project Best--Total Grant.....$371,006

1) New York City Board of Education Budget $107,549
2) College Budget 178,457
3) Modeling Innovative Program's Budget 85,000

4. BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION (Science - Spanish Program in J.H.S.)*

District	School	Number of Students	Number of Teachers
2	JHS 17	90	2
3	JHS 54	180	6
3	JHS 118	?	?
4	JHS 99	75	2
	IS 117	130	4
7	IS 155	180	6
8	JHS 125	180	6
	IS 52	?	?
9	IS 22	?	?
	JHS 82	120	4
	JHS 145	?	?
	IS 148	?	?
12	JHS 9[illegible]	?	?
14	IS 49	60	3
15	IS 136	90	4
16	JHS 57	?	?
19	IS 292	90	7
21	JHS 23[illegible]	?	?
24	IS 61	?	?
TOTALS 13 Districts	19 Schools	2 000	?

*Specific information unavailabel--totals based upon Department estimates

5. SPANISH INSTRUCTION (non-English class) Then Mainstream (Called Bilingual)

District	School	Source of Funds	Total Amount	Year	Number of Students	Bilingual Teachers
4	I.S. 117	Title I	$135,260	1969	40	1
	J.H.S. 19			1970	40	1
	J.H.S. 13			1970	40	1
5	J.H.S. 120	Was Title I ? Now District				
9	J.H.S. 22	District		1970	66	3
	I.S. 148	District		1969	60	3
	P.S. 4	District		1970	100	4
13	P.S. 46 P.S. 9 P.S. 20 J.H.S. 294	SUE	121,488	1969	150	4
14	I.S. 71	SUE	109,866	1970	50	2
	I.S. 49			1970	75	4
16	P.S. 116	Title I	43,364		90	3
15	8 schools	Title I	91,000	1969	240	7
1	P.S. 63	Title I	89 215	1970	40	2
TOTALS						
8 Districts	23 Schools		$590,193		1,015	37

6. SPANISH LANGUAGE ARTS FOR NON-ENGLISH CHILDREN

District	School	Source of Funds	Total Amount	Year	Number of Students	Bilingual Teachers
10	P.S.[illegible]5	SUE	$100,000	196[illegible]	1500	25 Para P.
	P.S.9(79)					
	P.S.9(115)					
	P.S.59	Schools participating				
	P.S.91	have 20 minutes of				
	P.S.26	Spanish				
	P.S.33					
	P.S.46					
	P.S.122					
	P.S.[illegible]0					
	P.S.7					
	P.S.9					
	J.H.S.79					
	J,H.115					
12	P.S.34	SUE	50,000	1969	125	2
16	P.S.75	District	?	1970	1980	6
	P.S.[illegible]1					
	P.S.145					
	P.S.274					
	P.S.299					
	P.S.304					
TOTALS 3 Districts	21 Schools		$150,000		3605	8

5. TEACHING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE*

District	School	Source of Funds	Total Amount	Year	Number of Students	Bilingual Teachers
8	P.S.60	Title I	$ 53,27[illegible]	1970	60	?
	P.S.62					
	P.S.75					
	P.S.39					
	P.S.130					
19	14 schools	Title I	12[illegible],990	1970	4 160	14 Asst.
TOTALS						
2 Districts	19 Schools		$1[illegible]2 26[illegible]		4,220	

*There are other TESL programs funded by Federal and State sources but they are not called Bilingual programs.

Appendix "D"

ANALYSIS OF BILINGUAL PROGRAMS IN NEW YORK CITY 1970-71

Categories	No. of Districts	No. of Schools	Students	Teachers*	Funds
1-3 (Bilingual)	10	37	4,418		$1,645,474
4-7 (Other Services	16	83	10,840		922,455
Total:	26	140	16,258		$2,567,929

*Incomplete Information

Bilingual Programs (Categories 1-3)

The 37 programs follow this pattern:

Elementary School	Junior High School	High School
2 bilingual schools 1 mini school 3 bilingual tracks 30 classes	1 track	none

32 of the 37 programs were started in 1970, but the total number of children in the 32 programs was 2,332 compared to the total number of children in 5 programs prior to 1970 which was 2,086.

26 of the 32 new programs are in Project Best and District 3 which consist of one or two grade levels. Although the programs are due for expansion, they are not yet comprehensive or well-structured programs.

Funds	Title I	Title VII	SUE	District	Total
Existing Programs		$ 764,403	$162,119	Amount unavail.	$ 926,522
New Programs	$233,249	485,703		" "	718,952
	$233,249	$1,250,106	$162,119		$1,645,474
	2 programs in 11 schools	6 programs in 22 schools	2 programs in 2 schools	2 programs in 2 schools	

Less money was allocated for new programs in 1970 than for existing programs.

Appendix "E"

TITLE VII--BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT

U.S. Distribution of Programs 1969-70

	State	No. of Programs	Grade Level	No. of Students	Funds
1.	Arizona	4	2 in 1st grade 1 K-1 1 9th grade	757	$ 224,802
2.	California	25	2 PK-12th grade 4 PK-6th grade 14 PK-3rd grade 5 7th-12th grade	6,097	2,499,438
3.	Connecticut	1	1 K-6th grade	80-100	75,000
4.	Florida	1	1 1st grade	240	55,000
5.	Hawaii	1	1 7-12th grade	177	53,000
6.	Illinois	1	1 1-8th grade	800	154,000
7.	Massachusetts	2	1 1-12th grade 1 K-6th grade	622	188,000
8.	Michigan	2	1 7-12th grade 1 K-12th grade	220	185,000
9.	Nebraska	1	1 K	344	69,000
10.	New Hampshire	1	1 1-3rd grade	149	70,000
11.	New Jersey	1	1 1st grade	791	275,000
12.	New Mexico	5	2 PK-6th grade 3 K-1st grade	1,570	371,000
13.	New York	3	1 1st-6th grade 2 PK-2nd grade	1,057	538,000
14.	Ohio	1	1 7th grade	177	69,000

(continued)

TITLE VII--BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT

U.S. Distribution of Programs 1969-70

	State	No. of Programs	Grade Level	No. of Students	Funds
15.	Oklahoma	1	1 in K	268	$ 98,500
16.	Pennsylvania	1	1 PK-12th grade	810	200,000
17.	Texas	15	11 K-4th grade 1 K 2 7th-12th grade 1 6-7th grade	5,427	1,288,770
18.	Utah	1	1 1-2nd grade	160	66,500
19.	Wisconsin	2 1	K-2nd grade 7-12th grade	220	45,258
Total:	19	69		20,986	$6,515,768

TITILE VII--BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT

Programs Receiving the Most Funds 1969-70 (Over $200,000)

State	Grade Level	Funds
California--Chula Vista	P-12th grade	$570,774
New Jersey--Vineland	1st. grade	275,000
California--Santa Ana	PK	246,000
New York--New York City P.S.25	1-6the grade	230,000
California--La Puente	k-3rd grade	205 264
Pennsylvania--Philadelphia	P-12th grade	200,000

Appendix "G"

TITLE VII--BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT

Grade Distribution of Programs 1969-70

Grade Level	No. of Programs
P-3rd grade (includes 1 year programs)	39
P-6th grade (complete elementary school)	11
P-8th grade	1
P-12th grade	5
Junior High School (1 year program)	2
Junior High School/High School	10
High School	1
Total:	69

Appendix "H"

TITLE VII--BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT

Comparative Allocation of Funds

	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72
Total Funds:	$6,500,000	$23,000,000	$25,000,000 (?)
State Allocation			
California	2,499,438	7,231,886	
Texas	1,288,770	4,701,481	
New York	538,000	1,495,059	
New York City	363,203	1,240,196	

States Receiving the Most Funds 1969-70

State	Amount	Number of Programs
California	$2,499,438	25 programs
Texas	1,288,770	15 programs
New York	538,000	3 programs
New Mexico	371,500	6 programs
New Jersey	275,000	1 program

Appendix "I"

TITLE VII--DISTRIBUTION OF HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS

State	No. of Programs	Grade Level
California	5 programs	Pre-kindergarten to 12th grade
	1 "	7th to 12th grade
Hawaii	1 "	7th to 12th grade
Massachussets	1 "	1st to 12th grade
Michigan	2 "	Kindergarten to 12th grade
		7th to 12th grade
Pennsylvania	1 "	Pre-Kindergarten to 12th grade
Texas	2 "	7th to 12th grade
Wisconsin	1 "	7th to 12th grade

Appendix "J"

TITLE VII BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT

New York City Programs

Program	Amount 1969-70	Amount 1970-71
Building Bilingual Bridges	$139,00	$ 191,974
Public School 25	224,203	308,972
District 4 Mini-School		91,301
District 13 7th & 8th grade		139,531
District 14 Pre-learning center		147,322
Project Best		361,006
TOTAL	$363,203	$ 1,240,106

Appendix "K"

TITLE VII PROPOSALS SUBMITTED FOR 1971-72

District	Proposal	Estimated Budget
1	School-Community Bilingual-Bicultural Program for Adolescents	$ 277,000
*2	Building Bilingual Bridges (to be recycled)	191,974
3	Bilingual Educational Program	330,000
*4	Junior High School 45 Mini-School (to be recycled)	94,694
6	Bilingual Sub-school for P.S. 109 M.	4[illegible],406
7	Bilingual Ed. Program I.S. 155	250,000
*7	P.S. 25 (to be recycled)	30[illegible],972
8	Bilingual Secondary School	350,000
9	Sister Schools for Teacher Training and Development of Material	2[illegible]0,000
10	Bilingual-Bicultural Teacher Training	100,000
11	Multi-faceted Program for Bilingual Children	200,000
12	Upgrading Bilingual Education	100,000
*13	Bilingual Education Program	139,531
*14	Bilingual Pre-School Learning Center	147,322
15	Dev. and Implementation of a Bilingual Program in P.S. 1	200,000
16	Bilingual Montessori School	500,6[illegible] or 3[illegible]7,340
17	Bilingual Center for Pre-Schoolers	300,000
18	(Very few bilingual children)	
19	Bilingual Program for Early Childhood Classes	116,000
20	Title I Schools	
21		
22		

TITLE VII PROPOSALS SUBMITTED FOR 1971-72

	District	Proposal	Estimated Budget
	23	Achievement for Bilingual Children	500,000
*	*Headqt.	Project Best	361,006
	Headqt.	A Bilingual Instructor Pilot Program for High School	250,000
	2	Puerto Rican Studies - Brooklyn College (In Migrant School Community Project)	200,000
			$5,272,107

*Programs already in existence--submitting proposals to be recycled.

Courses and Degrees Offered in New York City Colleges and Universities and the State University of New York that Specifically* Relate to the Education of the Puerto Rican Child as of 1970

Appendix L

16 OUT OF 35 COLLEGES REVIEWED HAD:

X = one course offered

College or University	Courses in **BILINGUAL EDUCATION		Courses in TESL		Courses in Puerto Rican Studies		Courses in the Spanish Language related to Puerto Ricans and/or Bilingual Education	
	Grad	Undergrad	Grad	UG	Grad	UG	Grad	Undergrad
City University of New York								
Baruch College						x Required for educ. degree		1 year required for education degree
Brooklyn College		x		x		x		
City College	MA (offered to limited number of students)	x		x required for educ. degree				1 year required for education degree
Hunter College	MA (Project Best) ***graduate diploma for teachers of P.R. children		MA					

College or University	Courses in **BILINGUAL EDUCATION		Courses in TESL		Courses in Puerto Rican Studies		Courses in the Spanish Language related to Puerto Ricans and/or Bilingual Education	
	Grad	Undergrad	Grad	UG	Grad	UG	Grad	Undergrad
Cortlandt State Teachers College			x					
Oswego Teachers College			x			x		
Stony Brook								

*Courses are offered in Latin American studies in some colleges but if the course was not specifically mentioned P.R. was not considered

**Bilingual Ed. Courses to teach in bil. programs and any prog. of instruction in Spanish and English

***Courses are in TESL. education culture but not specifically bilingual methods

Colleges or University	Courses in **BILINGUAL EDUCATION		Courses in TESL		Courses in Puerto Rican Studies		Courses in the Spanish Language related to Puerto Ricans and/or Bilingual Education	
	Grad	Undergrad	Grad	UG	Grad	UG	Grad	Undergrad
Lehman College	MA (Project Best)		x			Major		
Queens College						Major		
City University Community Colleges								
Kingsborough		2 year prog. (15 hrs. in Eng. and 9 hrs. subject matter in Spanish)						
Manhattan C.C.						Major		
Columbia Teachers College			MA Ph.D		x		x	
New York Univ.	MA (offered to limited no. of students)		BS Ph.D					
Fordham			x		2			
Long Island Univ. (C.W.Post)			x				x	
New School								
State Univ. of New York								

VIII

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allee, Dennis and Manuel Del Valle. "Instruction for Non-English-Speaking Puerto Rican Pupils in the New York City Public Schools." Memorandum to Senator Javits, February 10, 1971.

American Education. "Federal Funds - Projects under the new Bilingual Education Program." Vol. IV, No. 1, September 1969.

Anastasi, Anne and Fernando A. Cordova. "Some Effects of Bilingualism Upon the Intelligence Test Performance of Puerto Rican Children in New York City." The Journal of Educational Psychology, Vo. XLIV, No. 1, January 1953.

Anderson, Theodore and Mildred Boyer. Bilingual Schooling in the United States. (Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Austin, Texas) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2 vols. 1970.

Arsenian, Seth. Bilingualism and Mental Development: A Study of the Intelligence and the Social Background of Bilingual Children in New York City. New York: Columbia University Teachers College, 1937.

Barron, Milton L., ed. American Minorities: A Textbook of Readings in Intergroup Relations. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1957.

Brooks, Nelson N. "The Meaning of Bilingualism Today," Foreign Language Annals. Vol. LL, No. 3, March 1969.

The Center Forum. Special Issue: Bilingualism. Publication of the Center for Urban Education. Vol. IV, No. 1, September 1969.

Ching, Doris. "Methods for the Bilingual Child," Elementary Education. Vol. XLII, January 1965.

Cristian, Chester C. "The Acculturation of the Bilingual Child," Modern Language Journal. Vol. 49, March 1965.

Coleman, James S. et al. "Equality of Educational Opportunity." U.S. Office of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Cordasco, Frank M. "The Challenge of the Non-English-Speaking Child in American Schools," School and Society. Vol. XCVL, March 30, 1968.

Covello, Leonard with Guido D'Agostino. The Heart is the Teacher. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc., 1968.

Darcy, Natalie T. "Bilingualism and the Measurement of Intelligence: Review of a Decade of Research." The Journal of Genetic Psychology. Vol. CIII, December 1963.

Finocchiaro, Mary. Teaching English as a Second Language. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Fishman, Joshua A., et al. "Bilingualism in the Barrio," The Modern Language Journal. Vl. LIII, No. 3. March 1969.

Fishman, Joshua A. "Bilingualism, Intelligence and Language Learning," The Modern Language Journal. Vo. XLIX, No. 4, April 1965.

Fishman, Joshua A. "The Status and Prospects of Bilingualism in the United States," The Modern Language Journal. Vol. XLIX No. 3 March 1965.

Fishman, Joshua A., et al. Language Loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton & Company, 1966.

Gaarder, A. Bruce. "Teaching the Bilingual Child: Research, Development and Policy." The Modern Language Journal. Vol. 49, March 1965.

_____. "Organization of a Bilingual School," Journal of Social Issues. Vol. 23, April, 1967.

Glazer, Nathan and D.P. Moynihan. Beyond the Melting Pot. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press and Harvard University Press, 1963.

Greenspan, Richard. "The Education of the Puerto Rican Child." (Unpublished report prepared for the Puerto Rican Forum. 1970).

Hageny, William J. "Education Law - Handbook for School Boards." Albany: New York State School Board Association, 1970.

Handlin, Oscar, Ed., Immigration as a Factor in American History. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1959.

Haugen, Einar. Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide. American Dialect Society. No. 26, November 1956.

Hillson, Maurice, et al., Education and the Urban Community. New York: American Book Company, 1969.

Jensen, J. Vernon. "Effects of Childhood Bilingualism," Elementary English. Vol. 39, February 1962 and April 1962.

John, Vera P. and Vivian M. Horner. Early Childhood Bilingual Education. New York: The Modern Language Association, 1971.

The Journal of Social Issues. Special Issue: "Problems of Bilingualism." Vol. XXIII, No. 2, April 1967.

Liem, R. M. "... and Others." A report prepared for ASPIRA Inc., and presented at the Education Action Conference, January 1971.

Manuel, Hershel T. Spanish-Speaking Children in the Southwest: Their Education and the Public Welfare.
Austin, Texas: The University of Texas Press, 1965.

Margolis, Richard J., "The Losers: A Report on Puerto Ricans and the Public Schools." ASPIRA Inc., 1968.

Mills, C., Clarence Senior and Rose K. Senior. The Puerto Rican Journey.
New York: Harper & Bros. 1950.

The Modern Language Journal, Special issue: Bilingualism and the Bilingual Child. Vol. XLIX. Nos. 3 & 4, March and April 1965.

Modiano, Nancy. "National or Mother Tongue in Reading: A Comparative Study," Research in the Teaching of English. Vol. II, No. 1, April 1968.

National Education Association. "The Invisible Minority...Pero No Vencibles."
Report of the NEA-Tuscon Survey on the Teaching of Spanish to the Spanish-Speaking.
Washington D.C.: NEA, 1966.

National Elementary Principal. Special issue on Bilingualism, November 1970.

New York City Board of Education. "Annual Census of School Population."
Publication. No. 330, October 31, 1969.

_____. "Community District Profiles for 1969-70 School Year by Newly Aligned Community School Districts." September 1970.

_____. "Ethnic Distribution of Licensed Teaching Staff by District for the month of March 1969." Computer Data Sheets.

_____. "Implementation of the Design for the Improvement of Educational Opportunities for Puerto Rican Pupils in New York City Schools." May 1969.

_____. "Programs for Non-English Speaking Students." (Memorandum from S. Lester to J. Woodbury.) February 23, 1971.

_____. "Proposed Expenditures-Reimbursable Funds, 1970-71, State Urban Education Title I, ESEA." Report for Public Hearing, September 10, 1970.

_____. "Puerto Rican Profiles." Resource Materials for Teachers, 1964.

_____. The Puerto Rican Study 1953-1957. (A Report on the Education and Adjustment of Puerto Rican Pupils in the Public Schools of the City of New York.) New York, 1958.

_____. "State and Federal Programs 1969-1970." (Directory) 1970.

_____. "State Urban Education, Community Education Centers: Project Summaries." 1970-71.

_____. "State Urban Education, Quality Incentive Programs for 1969-70." (Directory).

_____. "State Urban Education, Quality Incentive Programs for 1970-71." (Mimeographed list).

_____. "Survey of Pupils Who Have Difficulties with the English Language." Publication No. 334, (P.N.S. 408), 1970.

_____. "Working with Pupils of Puerto Rican Background, A Guidance Manual." New York, 1967.

New York State Education Law Books. McKinnery's Consolidated Laws of New York, Annotated. Book 16, Education Law. St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1970.

New York Times. "Truancy in the Schools." February 2, 1970.

Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. "The Challenge of Bilingualism." Report of Working Committee, 1965.

Rodriquez Armando. "Manana in Motion," National Elementary Principal. Vol. XLIX, No. 4, February 1970.

Roeming, Robert F. "Bilingualism and the National Interest," The Modern Language Journal. Vol. LV, February, 1971.

Rogers, David. 110 Livingston Street. New York: Random House, 1968.

School and Society. "Education of the Underpriviledged." Special issue. February 18, 1967.

_____. "The Disadvantaged and Education." Special issue. March 30, 1968.

Secton, Patricia. Spanish Harlem. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Singer, Harry. "Bilingualism and Elementary Education," The Modern Language Journal. Vol. XL, No. 8, December 1956.

Soffietti, James P. Bilingualism and Biculturalism," The Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. XLVI, No. 4, April 1965

Tiremen, Lloyd S. Teaching Spanish Speaking Children. Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 1951.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. "Population Characteristics of Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States." November 1969.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education. "Draft--Guidelines for Title VII Bilingual Education Act."

_____. Bureau of Research. "Science Instruction in Spanish for Pupils of Spanish-speaking Background: An Experiment in Bilingualism." Project No. 2370. 1967.

U.S. Congress, Senate. "Bilingual Education" Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. U.S. Senate, 90th Congress, 1st. session. Washington D.C., 1967.

UNESCO. "The Use of the Vernacular in Education." Paris: UNESCO, 1953.

Vail, Edward O. "What will it be--Reading or Machismo and Soul?" The Clearing House. Vol. 45, No. 2, October 1970

Vazquez, Hector. "Discrimination Against Puerto Rican Professionals and Puerto Rican Pupils in New York City Public Schools." Statement delivered at Hearings on "The Minority Hiring Practices of the Board of Education in the City of New York" by the NYC Commission on Human Rights. New York: The Puerto Rican Forum, January 27, 1971.

Walsh, Donald D. "Bilingualism and Bilingual Education," Foreign Language Annals. Vol. II, No. 3, March 1969.